Remarks

In response to the Office Action mailed on March 13, 2009, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the following remarks. In the present application, claims 1, 10, 12, and 16 have been amended for clarification. Support for the amended claims may be found on at least page 12, lines 18-28 in the Specification. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-16 and 18-21 are pending in the application. Claims 1-3, 5-6 and 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Babst, et al. (7,194,404, hereinafter "Babst") in view Robertson et al. (US 2006/0277213, hereinafter "Robertson"). Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Babst in view of Robertson and in further in view of James et al. (US 2005/0198023, hereinafter "James"). Claims 10-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Babst in view of Robertson and in further view of Flasza et al. (US 2003/0233340, hereinafter "Flasza"). Claims 16 and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Flasza in view of Robertson and Babst. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Babst in view of Robertson and Atkin et al. (US 2004/0181176, hereinafter "Atkin"). Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Flasza in view of Robertson, Babst, and Atkin. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Flasza in view of Robertson, Babst, and Atkin.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-3 and 5-9

Claims 1-3 and 5-9 are rejected as being unpatentable over the combination of Babst and Robertson. The rejection of these claims is respectfully traversed.

Amended claim 1 specifies a method of operating a jump bar of a contact manager, comprising the steps of: assigning a character code to a displayed button of the jump bar, the jump bar comprising a plurality of buttons, wherein the character code is uniquely associated with an alphanumeric character of a character set having a single character code uniquely associated with each alphanumeric character of a plurality of alphanumeric characters from a plurality of languages, wherein the jump bar comprises a button data table including a plurality of rows comprising at least a plurality of character codes for the plurality of alphanumeric characters, the plurality of rows equal to a maximum number of buttons displayable in the jump bar, wherein each button of the plurality of buttons of the jump bar is associated with first and second alphanumeric characters of different languages; retrieving contact information from a contacts information database by comparing the assigned character code and the first alphanumeric character of the last names of contacts having associated contact information previously stored in the contacts information database; and displaying the retrieved contact information in a window of the contact manager.

It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Babst and Robertson fails to teach, disclose, or suggest each of the features specified in amended claim 1. For example, the aforementioned combination fails to disclose "wherein the jump bar comprises a button data table including a plurality of rows comprising at least a plurality of character codes for the plurality of alphanumeric characters, the plurality of rows equal to a maximum number of buttons displayable in the jump bar, wherein each button of the plurality of buttons of the jump bar is associated with first and second alphanumeric characters of different languages."

Babst discusses utilizing word chunks to enhance word prediction in response to receiving an input character. After a displayed word or word chunk is selected, selectable words including the selected word chunk are displayed. Using the word chunks, the number of keystrokes necessary to access a word is reduced. See Col. 3, lines 1-12. Babst however, fails to disclose a button data table including a plurality of rows equal to a maximum number of displayable buttons, as specified in amended claim 1. In contrast, Babst merely discusses a German language keyboard (see Fig. 1) showing 128 German language characters in eight (8) rows of the keyboard. Thus, Babst fails to disclose that the 8 rows of the German language keyboard are equal to a maximum number of displayable buttons. Babst further fails to disclose that each button of the plurality of buttons of the jump bar is associated with first and second alphanumeric characters of different languages. In contrast, the "keys" of the German language keyboard in Fig. 1 of Babst are only associated with characters of a single language. Moreover, although Babst does discuss the use of various languages (e.g., romance and agglutinating languages – see Col. 12, lines 36-63), first and second alphanumeric characters of different languages are not discussed as being associated with each button of a jump bar.

Robertson fails to cure the deficiencies of Babst. Robertson discusses a computer system for assisting users in locating and sharing information with other users by providing a user interface which users can establish contact relationships with other users. Robertson further discusses functionality for users to search the contacts of contacts of the respective user and the search may be limited in scope. See paragraph 0012. Robertson however, fails to disclose "wherein the jump bar comprises a button data table including a plurality of rows comprising at least a plurality of character codes

for the plurality of alphanumeric characters, the plurality of rows equal to a maximum number of buttons displayable in the jump bar, wherein each button of the plurality of buttons of the jump bar is associated with first and second alphanumeric characters of different languages." In contrast, Robertson is merely concerned with locating and sharing contact information in a computer system. Thus, Robertson is silent regarding the aforementioned features specified in amended claim 1.

Based on the foregoing, the combination of Babst and Robertson fails to teach, disclose, or suggest each of the features specified in amended claim 1. Therefore, amended claim 1 is allowable and the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn. Claims 2-3, 5-6, and 8-9 depend from amended claim 1 and thus specify at least the same features. Therefore, these claims are also allowable for at least the same reasons and the rejection of these claims should also be withdrawn.

Claim 4

Claim 4 is rejected as being unpatentable over the combination of Babst, Robertson, and James. The rejection of this claim is respectfully traversed.

Claim 4 depends from independent claim 1 and thus specifies at least the same features. As discussed above, the combination of Babst and Robertson fails to teach, disclose, or suggest at least "wherein the jump bar comprises a button data table including a plurality of rows comprising at least a plurality of character codes for the plurality of alphanumeric characters, the plurality of rows equal to a maximum number of buttons displayable in the jump bar, wherein each button of the plurality of buttons of the jump bar is associated with first and second alphanumeric characters of different languages."

It is respectfully submitted that Jones fails to cure the deficiencies of Babst and Robertson. James discusses the selection and ordering of one or more sets of linguistic objects for text disambiguation. James further discusses the ordering of a first list of items in a first language and a second list of items in a second language and where the two lists of items are displayed in an order based on the first language having a priority over the second language or vice versa. See paragraph 0009. As discussed above, James is merely concerned with the ordering of linguistic objects for disambiguating different languages. James however, is silent regarding a button data table (of a jump bar) including a plurality of rows equal to a maximum number of displayable buttons or that each button of the plurality of buttons of the jump bar is associated with first and second alphanumeric characters of different languages.

Based on the foregoing, the combination of Babst, Robertson, and James fails to teach, disclose, or suggest each of the features specified in claim 4. Therefore, claim 4 is allowable and the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn.

Claims 10-15

Claims 10-15 are rejected as being unpatentable over the combination of Babst, Robertson, and Flasza. The rejection of these claims is respectfully traversed.

Amended independent claims 10 specifies similar features as independent claim 1, discussed above, and thus is allowable over the combination of Babst and Robertson for at least the same reasons. Flasza fails to cure the deficiencies of Babst and Robertson. Flasza discusses the ordering of character strings by determining which of two character strings has a lower collating weight according to a first dictionary sort order table with a non-unique collating sequence, and determining which of the two character strings has a

lower collating weight according to a second dictionary sort order table with a unique collating sequence. See paragraph 0010. Flasza also discusses multiple code points associated with a single alphabetic character. See Figures 1-3 (showing two code points each for the upper and lower case characters A-J).

As discussed above, Flasza is merely concerned with the ordering of character strings using unique and non-unique collating sequences based on collating weights (e.g., upper and lower case characters may have different weights – see Flasza, paragraph 0023). Therefore, Flasza is silent regarding a button data table (of a jump bar) including a plurality of rows equal to a maximum number of displayable buttons or that each button of the plurality of buttons of the jump bar is associated with first and second alphanumeric characters of different languages. For example, Flasza discusses multiple code points (i.e., upper and lower case alphabetic characters such as the English language characters A-J) associated with a single alphabetic character. However, this is different than a jump bar button associated with first and second alphanumeric characters of different languages, specified in amended claim 10.

Based on the foregoing, the combination of Babst, Robertson, and Flasza fails to teach, disclose, or suggest each of the features specified in amended claim 10. Therefore, amended claim 10 is allowable and the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn. Claims 11-15 depend from amended claim 10 and thus specify at least the same features. Therefore, these claims are also allowable for at least the same reasons and the rejection of these claims should also be withdrawn.

Claims 16 and 18-20

Claims 16 and 18-20 are rejected as being unpatentable over the combination of Flasza in view of Robertson and Babst. The rejection of these claims is respectfully traversed.

Amended independent claim 16 specifies similar features as independent claims 10, discussed above, and thus is allowable over the combination of Flasza, Robertson, and Babst for at least the same reasons. Therefore, the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn. Claims 18-20 depend from amended claim 16 and thus specify at least the same features. Therefore, these claims are also allowable for at least the same reasons and the rejection of these claims should also be withdrawn.

Claim 7

Claim 7 is rejected as being unpatentable over the combination of Babst, Robertson, and Atkin. The rejection of this claim is respectfully traversed.

Claim 7 depends from independent claim 1 and thus specifies at least the same features. As discussed above, the combination of Babst and Robertson fails to teach, disclose, or suggest at least "wherein the jump bar comprises a button data table including a plurality of rows comprising at least a plurality of character codes for the plurality of alphanumeric characters, the plurality of rows equal to a maximum number of buttons displayable in the jump bar, wherein each button of the plurality of buttons of the jump bar is associated with first and second alphanumeric characters of different languages."

It is respectfully submitted that Atkin fails to cure the deficiencies of Babst and Robertson. Atkin discusses providing Unicode support in legacy operating systems. A

focus hook module, keyboard hook module, and keystroke conversion module are registered with the legacy operating system. The focus book module determines whether the currently active application is Unicode capable. The keystroke conversion module converts the keyboard events into Unicode characters which are sent back to the keyboard hook module. See paragraphs 0008 and 0009. As discussed above, Atkin is merely concerned with Unicode support in legacy operating systems. Therefore, Atkins is silent regarding a button data table (of a jump bar) including a plurality of rows equal to a maximum number of displayable buttons.

Based on the foregoing, the combination of Babst, Robertson, and Atkins fails to teach, disclose, or suggest each of the features specified in claim 7. Therefore, claim 7 is allowable and the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn.

Claim 15

Claim 15 is rejected as being unpatentable over the combination of Flasza, Robertson, Babst, and Atkin. The rejection of this claim is respectfully traversed.

Claim 15 depends from independent claim 10 and thus specifies at least the same features. As discussed above, the combination of Flasza, Robertson, Babst, and Atkin fails to teach, disclose, or suggest at least "wherein the jump bar comprises a button data table including a plurality of rows comprising at least a plurality of character codes for the plurality of alphanumeric characters, the plurality of rows equal to a maximum number of buttons displayable in the jump bar, wherein each button of the plurality of buttons of the jump bar is associated with first and second alphanumeric characters of different languages." Therefore, claim 15 is allowable and the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn.

Claim 21

Claim 21 is rejected as being unpatentable over the combination of Flasza, Robertson, Babst, and Atkin. The rejection of this claim is respectfully traversed.

Claim 21 depends from amended claim 16 and thus specifies at least the same features. As discussed above, the combination of Flasza, Robertson, Babst, and Atkin fails to teach, disclose, or suggest at least "wherein the jump bar comprises a button data table including a plurality of rows comprising at least the plurality of character codes for the plurality of alphanumeric characters, the plurality of rows equal to a maximum number of the buttons displayable in the jump bar." Therefore, claim 21 is allowable and the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application is now in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to call the Applicant's attorney at the number listed below.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.

Date: **June 29, 2009**

/Alton Hornsby III/
Alton Hornsby III
Reg. No. 47,299

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(404) 954-5064

27488
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE